UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/526,440	03/02/2005	Kazuhisa Ose	Nissin-3-PCT/Minori	3389
156 KIRSCHSTEII	7590 11/07/2007 N, OTTINGER, ISRAEL		EXAMINER	
& SCHIFFMILLER, P.C. 489 FIFTH AVENUE NEW YORK, NY 10017			CHEUNG, VICTOR	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			3714	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/07/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

•	H		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
•	10/526,440	OSE ET AL.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Victor Cheung	3714	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become AB ANDONE	J. lely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
Responsive to communication(s) filed on 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☑ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro		
Disposition of Claims			
4) Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.		
Application Papers			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accomplicated any not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the liderawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate	

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 1 objected to because of the following informalities:

For clarity, a comma should be inserted in line 6 to read: --less than 10 µm, and a light reflectance--.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dehoff et al. (US Patent No. 5,452,219) in view of Ginneken et al. (Applied Optics).

Dehoff et al. disclose a method of making a tooth mold, the method including the step of laser scanning a model tooth (Abstract). The model may be made of materials such as waxes, ceramics, glass, porcelain, plastics, and metals (Col. 7, Lines 8-10), each of which are non-transparent or semi-transparent. Dehoff et al. disclose that the outer coating of the model can be varied to produce a myriad of optical and mechanical properties (Col. 7, Lines 41-45). The accuracy of the laser scan readings is dependent on the tooth model being reflective (Col. 5, Lines 65-68). Dehoff et

al. disclose that the color of the tooth can be varied and can be made to produce a color capable of producing a natural appearance (Col. 7, Lines 24-45).

However, Dehoff et al. do not specifically disclose the roughness of the surface.

Ginneken et al. disclose that in modeling, one factor of reflectance is based on the roughness of the surface (Page 130, Introduction).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to optimize the roughness to a value between 0.1µm and 10µm and to have a reflectance of 70% or higher, thereby providing a model that is easily and accurately scanned. As disclosed by Dehoff et al. and Ginneken et al., the accuracy of a laser depends on both the roughness and reflectance of the model being scanned. Where a parameter is recognized to be a result-effective variable, it is prima facie obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to determine an optimum value for that parameter through routine experimentation. See MPEP 2144.05(II).

It would have been obvious to have a color difference ΔE^* ab of 15 or less, thereby producing a color shade representative of a real tooth.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's 4. disclosure. Durbin et al. (USPN 6,592,371) disclose a method for imaging a three dimensional structure using lasers. Dehoff et al. (USPN 5,691,905) disclose prosthetic teeth and teeth molding materials.

Application/Control Number: 10/526,440 Page 4

Art Unit: 3714

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Victor Cheung whose telephone number is (571) 270-1349. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 9-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Pezzuto can be reached on (571) 272-6996. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Victor Cheung November 1, 2007 RONALD LANEAU